present an excellent argument for program budgeting as an alternative to more traditional methods.

D. The Importance of Establishing an On-Going Facility Planning Function

Facility planning may take place in an atmosphere of crisis that reduces the opportunity to develop the most effective solutions. To be of value, facility planning must include comprehensive analyses of current and anticipated facility problems and provide the opportunities for a rational choice from alternative remedies.

Although facility problems are most acute in the largest jurisdictions, very few counties or cities have established a working structure to manage the use of criminal justice space and facilities by the many agencies they house. Adjusting available space and providing new facilities to meet the needs of users from many departments and government branches generally requires substantial mutual agreement and the services of an agency empowered to make decisions. It does not appear that these procedures are operative in any significant degree at this time.

The process of obtaining new space or modifying existing space is also subject to many bureaucratic constraints. Rarely is there a planning agency or other body responsible for assigning and monitoring space for all components of the criminal justice system. Within and among criminal justice agencies, a unit head who is effective in intra- and inter-agency relationships may be able to improve the unit's problems by being sufficiently energetic and persistent when an opportunity occurs. In that process, however, even the winner of existing space may be able to make only limited gains by working within the constraints of available space. When space cannot be created and other agencies cannot be forced to relocate, the situation is comparable to a game of chance where participants bid for the next available space using the earliest information they can obtain without bidding up the price. The process resembles what is described as a zero-sum game, in that the total space remains constant, so that what is given to one unit must be taken from another. In such situations, occupants rarely give up space voluntarily, preferring to hoard it as an asset which they know cannot easily be replaced. A unit relinquishing space it no longer needs does so with little likelihood it can receive a "space credit" to be redeemed at a later time if its needs again should increase.

Moreover, solved facility problems are often replaced by new problems unless there is an organizational means of preventing their recurrence. To the degree that facility difficulties are the result of inadequate planning, they can be expected to recur unless an administrative facility planning capability is established within the court organization. Selecting workable solutions depends entirely upon balancing conflicting needs, costs, and time priorities. In the final
analysis, the practical realization of an effective facility demands as much of art as of science and the best chance for its development lies in the creation of an on-going facility planning capability under the administrative guidance of a single facility planning coordinator. The following are some recommendations for establishing such a capability:

A facility planning function should be established as a component of court management and located in a centralized staff unit at a point in the organization where services can economically be provided wherever they are needed. The level of planning skill and experience developed here should be of benefit to the entire court and relate to other criminal justice and government agencies in the courthouse and elsewhere. The designated function should be the single point of internal and external contact within the court for facility related topics and the point of reference for facility planning information and services.

An inventory of existing space should be assembled. It must be regularly updated and periodically reviewed. Information should be collected from all department heads on simple reporting forms showing the actual space use in their units. Based upon that information, planning can proceed, future needs can be estimated, and specific facility programs can be developed.

The goals of a facility planning capability should be to assemble a reservoir of information about facility use and needs and the nucleus of a facility planning organization around which special management teams also can be constituted, if necessary, to handle unavoidable emergency situations. With that groundwork, problems can be solved more quickly and easily.

Vacant space is the planner's major asset. It must be searched out with diligence and should not be assigned for use until the total organization's needs have been reviewed.

The planning office should prepare space plans and statements of facility needs on a periodic basis, showing all space use and needs. It should coordinate purchases of furniture and equipment, coordinate leases or other arrangements for new space, and generally be responsible for implementing facility-use policy.

With these capabilities and information in hand and centralized in one organizational location, it will be feasible to develop facility policies and enter into negotiations with other agencies to arrange for policy implementation. The concept of court facility planning should be one of anticipation and action rather than reaction, one of forecasting needs and developing feasible solutions before problems materialize to the point of crises. Negotiations with the various government agencies responsible for funding are inevitably part of the problem-solving process. They should be entered into with the support of as much facility and facility-need information as the court can assemble. Otherwise, any proposed solutions may run the risk of being far from optimum.
Photographs 1 & 2: Two Historic Courthouses

PHOTOGRAPH 1: In Lakeport, California, the old Lake County Courthouse currently is being restored and refurbished. When the work is complete, the wood and stucco building will include a museum on the first floor and a working Superior Court facility on the second. Located on the town square directly in front of a new and modern court and county building, the old courthouse will increase the courtroom capacity as well as being a functioning reminder of the history of this northern California county. (1870)

1. Restoration of Lake County Courthouse, Lakeport, CA, 1977
PHOTOGRAPH 2: The Washington County Courthouse in Springfield, Kentucky, is one of the oldest courthouses in that state. Seen in the photograph is the original woodframe courthouse while the stone structure just visible to the left is a later office addition. Under the portico, the main door opens directly into the courtroom. The marriage record of Abraham Lincoln's parents is filed here in the clerk's office. (1814)
PHOTOGRAPH 3: Somerset County Courthouse, Somerville, NJ, 1975. This classic white marble court building with a gilded statue of justice atop the dome, is a handsome and formal structure of cruciform plan. Four wings surround a central rotunda, severely limiting the possibility of expanding space for the County and Superior Courts of this growing suburban county. A new court facility is to be constructed on another portion of the two block county government center. (1900)
Two Courthouses with Problems of Growth

PHOTOGRAPHS 4 & 5: Clarke and Frederick are suburban counties of comparable size but have not been able to find comparable solutions to their court facility needs. The Clarke County Courthouse is typical, containing county offices as well as courts on its well-worn lower floors, and also a jail on the top floor. The barred fourth floor windows can be seen. Although jail and court growth needs are well known and several design and planning studies have developed solutions, voter support has not been achieved. Insufficient and inadequate space, poor accessibility, and deteriorated accommodations so far have not been improved.

Citizen support for new court facilities in Frederick, however, has been actively and successfully marshalled with the result that a new court facility is in design. In cooperation with state government, a multi-service center is to be constructed housing all court and related agencies of the county and state. The existing courthouse will be renovated and retained in use, primarily as a public library.
5. Frederick County Courthouse, Frederick, MD, 1976 - To be Replaced
PHOTOGRAPH 6: A four block square in downtown Manhattan, New York City, is home for a large group of specialized court facilities. Several can be seen in the photograph. Running south on Centre Street, to the left, are the Manhattan Men's House of Detention (now closed) and the adjacent Criminal Courts Building. This is a specialized building for limited and general jurisdiction criminal courts currently with about 40 courtrooms and space for the New York County District Attorney as well as some related agencies. Other agencies have been relocated to other buildings in the vicinity to make room for courtroom expansions. Further south is a state office building housing court administrative and court-related offices and, south of that, the State Supreme Court Building which houses the civil term of the general trial court. Further south, the tall pyramid-topped building to the left is the United States courthouse on Foley Square. On the right side of Centre Street is the Civil Court Building, home of the limited jurisdiction civil court, but also containing two floors of major felony trial courts. One block to its west, and not seen in the picture, is the family Court Building, used principally for juvenile and non-support causes.
6. Centre Street Looking South, New York, NY, 1972, Showing Civil Court Building Right, Criminal Courts Building Left, U.S. Courthouse Left Center
PHOTOGRAPHS 7, 8, 9: According to the historic marker visible in Photograph 7, the courthouse served Hudson County from 1910 to 1966 and is considered to be one of America's outstanding renaissance structures. Graffiti, broken lamps, boarded doors and windows, and extensive leaks pose a challenging question about the fate of such structures. The rotunda can hardly be done justice in black and white; its design was colorful and complex. Courtrooms were designed in palatial style. Attempts at fund raising to restore the building and return it to use have been frequent, but unsuccessful.
7. Entrance, Hudson County Courthouse, Jersey City, NJ, 1972
8. Rotunda, Hudson County Courthouse, Jersey City, NJ, 1972
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VI. USING CASELOAD FORECASTS TO PROJECT COURT FACILITY NEEDS

One of the most useful methods for estimating future court facility needs is to forecast, by category, the caseload which the court will potentially be handling. Such forecasts, although tentative, can suggest the perimeters for a court's possible future space needs and the range of specialized functions which the court's facility may need to accommodate. Because caseload forecasts for facility planning purposes must necessarily look far into the future, commonly used short-term projection techniques, such as linear regression, are not generally useful. Moreover, court facility projections must also take into account possible changes not only in the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the jurisdiction but in the statutes and procedures which govern the court's operation as well.

Forecasting is a complex science and should be undertaken only by those with sufficient technical expertise to know how to select an appropriate forecasting technique and interpret the results. A very general summary of forecasting methods is provided in this chapter. However, those interested in pursuing the topic, should consult specialized texts on the subject. Of particular value to court facility planners is a recent publication prepared by Harry O. Lawson and Barbara Gletne: Workload Measures in the Court, published by the National Center for State Courts in 1980. Chapter Five, "Planning and Forecasting Personnel Needs," presents useful discussion of various short-term forecasting methodologies and their applications.

A. Useful Forecasting Information

1. Caseload Information

The most widely used measure of caseload volume is the number of case filings which enter a court during a chronological year. The annual number of case filings in a court presents a summary view of all of the business it conducts, including the indictments issued, arraignments conducted, praecipes filed, complaints initiated in a lower court, etc. The number of case filings is, thus, a measure of the court's activities as well as those of the police and prosecutorial agencies which result in the caseload which enters the court system. In gathering annual case filing information, it is important to gather data for consistent periods of time, i.e., fiscal years, calendar years, etc., so that comparable activity trends can be developed.

The output of a court is measured by the number of case terminations or dispositions which are made. The number of case dispositions is a convenient measure of judicial system output but should be used carefully when relations between output and space needs are developed. Dispositions must be broken down into discrete
categories, such as contested and uncontested matters, pleas and trials, bench trials and jury trials, and trials and out-of-court settlements, in order to provide a basis for identifying the facility needs associated with these various types of proceedings.

2. Case processing information

Case filing and disposition information, if discretely broken down into appropriate categories, can provide the basis for subsequently identifying the various steps required to process the court's caseload and the judicial, staff, equipment and space needs associated with case processing. The number of dispositions by each case type and the relative length of time required to process each case type can also be used to develop a weighted caseload profile of the court which will be particularly helpful for projecting the amount of judicial space (courtrooms and chambers) which the court will need, assuming that the mix of particular cases and case processing steps required remains constant.

3. Other factors to be considered

Caseload and case processing information must be analysed within the context of the overall operations of the court. There are many refinements which need to be made in the translation of case filings into case processing needs and then into personnel and space needs. To develop accurate facility projections, it is important to deal separately with the facility requirements necessary to accommodate each component of the court's caseload, e.g., criminal, civil, juvenile, domestic relations, traffic, etc. It is equally important to anticipate the effects on future courtroom use and space requirements that may follow changes in statutes, penalties, and court policies and procedures.

As discussed earlier in Chapter III, the specific characteristics of a court's facility needs are determined by the nature of its caseload. Juvenile and domestic relations caseloads, for example, are processed in non-courtroom environments as well as courtrooms. However, the ratio of non-courtroom use for these proceedings also depends upon the relative emphasis which the court has placed upon administrative approaches for handling these types of cases and the use of such alternatives to conventional adjudication as diversion and counselling programs. Similarly, the handling of traffic violations cases can be affected by administrative and/or legislative decisions. An expanded pay-by-mail program for minor moving and parking violations, for example, might need less public space or fewer clerical personnel for a given caseload than would be required in a system which placed greater emphasis on personal appearances. On the other hand, assuming a reasonably constant ratio of courtroom processing to non-courtroom processing of traffic violations, courtroom requirements might largely depend upon the number of tickets issued for moving violations which, because of their relatively severe penalties, are more likely to be contested.
The computation of court facility needs to accommodate the court's future business may also be affected by changes in court procedures or programs. For example, probation caseloads have been increasing more rapidly than total criminal caseloads because of the more frequent use of probation by courts and the more frequent use of pre-sentence reports. As a consequence, in many jurisdictions, probation staffs -- and their facility needs -- have been growing more rapidly than courtroom needs. Similarly, personnel needs for clerks' offices have been influenced by the introduction of business and data processing equipment of various types, while their space requirements have been drastically affected by the use of flat files instead of folded files, by microfilm rather than paper records, and by new designs for shelving and file cabinets.

All of these personnel and space needs ultimately relate back to caseload requirements, however, and the case processing requirements for each component of the court's caseload must be analysed separately from that starting point.

B. Long Range Caseload Forecasting Methods and Their Applications

1. Forecasting Methodologies

Four different types of forecasting techniques can be used to develop estimates of future court caseloads. The methods vary in the degree of weight they give to the statistical record of prior year caseloads. The first method relies totally on past caseload history; the second relates certain variables from the past to future projects. The third focuses primarily on projected caseload trends. The fourth bases its forecasting techniques on developments in comparable jurisdictions.

a. Method I: Analysis of prior caseload history information.

The first method projects the trend of available prior caseload history information without correlating this trend with any other variables. This method is particularly sensitive to errors because no evaluation is made of special factors that might explain past trends and which may not be present in the future. Moreover, if only a few years of data are at hand, the trend can mistakenly be based upon a short-term deviation from a long-term and stable development pattern. Because of the recent history of caseload increases which most courts have experienced, this method will generally yield a high estimate of future caseloads.

b. Method 2: Analysis of prior caseload and population history information.

The second method relates caseload growth over a base period in the past to population growth in the same period and projects that ratio
forward. Method 2 assumes that the same mechanisms relating caseload to population in the past will continue in the future. The method does not analyse the factors which may have contributed to the past correlation of population growth and caseload increase, e.g., cause-effect relationships.

c. Method 3: Projections of population growth

The third method for caseload projection assumes a direct correlation between future population changes and caseload changes. It has no memory of past history and usually produces lower estimates of future caseload increases than are produced by either of the two previously discussed methods. Method 3 assumes, in effect, that the long-term fundamental pressures to create caseloads in the future are related solely to population changes that will take place following the base date at which the projections begin. This method should be used only when historical data is not available.

d. Method 4: Correlation of projected population growth with caseload volumes in comparable jurisdictions.

The fourth method for projecting future caseloads is useful mainly to verify the projections made by other methods. It is based upon an assumed correlation of caseload volume with population volume in jurisdictions with similar social, political, economic and other population characteristics. To apply this method, the projected future population volume of the jurisdiction is used as a basis for identifying other jurisdictions similarly situated with current populations comparable to those projected for the jurisdiction in question. The caseload volumes for the comparable jurisdictions are then used as a basis for developing caseload projections for the court system conducting the study. Method 4 is weak in its capacity to take into account unique factors in a jurisdiction which might have a bearing on caseload statistics. The method might, nevertheless, be fairly accurate if used in many of the smaller and relatively stable rural counties.

2. Necessary Information for Preparing Forecasts

To develop caseload forecasts, the following data are needed:

- statistical population histories, preferably based on reports of the U.S. Bureau of the Census and updated annually by local planners;
- population forecasts, with all terms fully defined and described;
- statistical caseload histories
- court staffing and facility size histories;
The data collected in these various categories should cover the same period of years and use consistent definitions and terminology. Comparable information relating to population history, caseload history and court staff and facility needs should also be obtained for other counties and judicial districts in the state.

Caseload forecasts produced by these methods will give a general picture of future trends. The forecasts will not explicitly project the annual variations around the trends, although they will be sensitive to past variations which established the trends. If past caseload statistics fluctuate widely from year to year, the reasons for such variations should be sought and the possibility of their continuing to zig-zag should be considered.

Population and other forecast data should be obtained from reliable and disinterested sources and effort should be made to verify reliability of this information by using multiple sources and forecasting techniques wherever possible. County planning departments, for example, are sometimes optimistic in their growth projections to be consistent with the goals of the county plan, and have been known to overestimate net in-migration by ignoring the fact that there may not be any nearby place where it could come from. In this regard, regional population forecasts which consider sources of in-migration for each county, may be more realistic sources to use in assessing population growth. Once total population projections are developed, they should be analysed in terms of the component population groups represented.

3. Using Forecast Projection Results

For those using forecast projections, two points should be kept in mind:

(1) Each projection should be prepared by selecting the forecasting method which, in comparison with all relevant facts, seems most reliable; and

(2) If no technique seems sufficiently reliable, the estimate should be based upon a comparison of the results of all techniques and any other relevant facts not reflected in the historical data.

In short, a planner must go well beyond the weaknesses of simple statistical comparisons and straight line projections. Any projection, nevertheless, is no more than an educated guess of the probable averaged future value of varying phenomena. The reliability of the projection is limited by such factors as (1) inaccuracies in the data base; (2) too short a period of past statistics to produce accurate interpretations of zigs or zags; (3) powerful external influences affecting caseloads during the forecast period which cannot be accommodated by the statistical techniques; (4) too much fluctuation in past statistics to permit clear identification of underlying trends, or (5) inability of the projection to delineate annual, monthly or daily fluctuations.
4. Sensitivity of Long Range Forecast Data to Error

Projections of population, caseloads, and case processing workloads are subject to the charge of error and deviation from accepted standards of reliability. The limited use of these projects for facility planning should be understood. They can be used as a guide to what may happen in the future but never as an absolute description of what will happen. Planners need this guideline to establish an approximate frame of reference for anticipating possible court facility needs and to examine possible court facility options in response to these needs. By no means should planners rigidly rely on these projections as predictors of the future; they are but one piece of a multi-part picture that must be developed from many sources over a substantial period of time.

In dealing with statistical data, there is always the temptation to make use of computer capabilities in jurisdictions where they exist. One should approach the use of computers for caseload forecasting with great caution unless the data base in the jurisdiction is extremely accurate and complete and has been so for many years. The calculations needed to produce the various correlations are not too complex for pencil and paper and manual manipulation.

The time consuming part of caseload forecasting is in the collection, correction and assessment of data which relies heavily on manual tasks. It is at this point in the process, however, that the validity of the forecasts is largely determined. Although the statistical accuracy of caseload forecasting techniques is not presently highly developed, any significant improvement will come from a better understanding of the relationships between caseload and the factors which generate caseload rather than from quicker computations made possible by the use of a computer.
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VII. DEVELOPING AND USING COURT FACILITY EVALUATION CHECKLISTS

A. Introduction

In most states, court facilities run the gamut in age, size, use and condition. They do share, however, one characteristic in common; they are the facilities in which most courts will most likely continue to be housed for many years. While the prospect of replacing an outmoded facility or creating a statewide system of new courthouses may hold many attractions, it rarely has overwhelmed taxpayers or legislators.

In the search for practical ways to improve existing facilities, there has been little assistance for planners or court personnel. As noted earlier, most of the published facility standards are designed specifically to guide new construction and are far less helpful for identifying the problems of existing facilities or for pointing out practical ways to improve them. When a county courthouse committee wishes to know what to do about its facility problems or when an entire state's judicial system and county court facilities are reviewed to determine how reorganizations can best proceed, the critical task for the facility planner is to assess the quality of the individual existing court buildings against general standards of adequacy applicable to the local or state court system.

B. Using Evaluation Checklists

In light of the range of ages, sizes and conditions which characterize the "typical" courthouse as well as the financial pressures facing most jurisdictions, a systematic methodology for developing objective assessments of court facilities is essential. This chapter presents a series of facility evaluation checklists, together with suggestions for their application to typical existing courthouses which may be both independent court facilities or parts of larger systems. The checklists are broad in scope, addressing the features common to most existing facilities. They are designed to be applied to the country's most typical courthouses -- those which are relatively small, fairly old and located in non-metropolitan jurisdictions of less than 50,000 persons -- as well as to newer and larger courts in urban areas. The checklists are intended to be used by persons familiar with judicial operations and facilities but without any significant architectural or construction background. Use of the checklists, however, cannot substitute for professional analysis in planning the renovation or redesign of judicial facilities which should be performed before any final space decisions are made.

The checklist evaluations do not differentiate good and poor courthouses by their relative age, size, location, or the amount of money that has been put into them, but rather by the extent to which
they are capable of accommodating and facilitating the judicial functions they house. One important factor which must be taken into consideration in this evaluation process, however, is the level of financial support available for the construction, maintenance and operation of each facility.

Funding problems exist in most jurisdictions. They are common to the largest and the smallest, and to the most responsive as well as those least concerned with the physical well-being of their judicial systems. Financial limitations common to many jurisdictions have resulted in certain commonly encountered facility problems. Most notable among these problems are the following:

- a disregard for the provision of private and secure circulation areas because of the expense involved;
- insufficient maintenance and equipment budgets;
- sharing of spaces used infrequently

In light of the pervasive effects of financial constraints, the checklists permit planners to establish space need priorities. For example, the quality or area of existing spaces cannot compensate for a lack of necessary spaces. The poor quality of an existing jury room is a less serious deficiency than the absence of a jury room entirely.

For those jurisdictions conducting statewide court facility evaluations, the checklists provide ways of examining a state's court facilities to determine how they contribute to the court's capability to deliver equal justice under the law. They are particularly useful to determine:

- in which existing facilities the components of the court system under the current caseload can function satisfactorily:
- to collect relevant information for projecting the cost of necessary immediate improvements; and
- to estimate the extent, type and costs of improvements that can bring an entire system of facilities to an acceptable level of quality over a period of time.

The checklists are designed to be used in sequence and as a unit. The first checklist lists spaces that are necessary in a courthouse. The second assesses the area of each space actually existing. The third examines the accessibility of existing spaces to one another. The fourth is directed toward the accommodations and furnishing of the facility. A methodology is also presented for using the checklists to develop comparative assessments of multiple facilities within a jurisdiction and for relating a facility's adequacy to its operational demands.
C. A Suggested Evaluation Methodology

1. Framework for Evaluating a Court Facility

   As a facility, a courthouse consists of a group of spaces (rooms, corridors, lobbies, etc.) designated for specific activities and occupants. To evaluate the facility in terms of its adequacy, a series of questions must be addressed:

   (1) Does the facility provide the necessary spaces to conduct court operations?

   (2) Is the area provided for each "space" of sufficient size to support the occupants and their activities?

   (3) Is the accessibility of the spaces to one another appropriate in view of the access demands placed upon them in the courts of their use?

   (4) Are the accommodations of each of the spaces -- furnishings, lighting, heating, etc. -- appropriate to their functions?

   (5) Can the space support the case processing needs for which it is used?

   Even the smallest courthouse, for example, must have a courtroom. It is a necessary space. The area for the courtroom should be of sufficient size to permit the conduct of whatever functions are regularly assigned to it. The courtroom should be accessible to everyone who will have occasion to use it and its location should also provide proper security and privacy to these various users, as needed. It should also provide appropriate accommodations for these users, in terms of heating, cooling and ventilating systems, comfortable seats, etc.

2. Necessary Data for Conducting a Facility Evaluation

   Court structures can be evaluated through the use of data gathered from various sources which is formatted in a manner that provides a qualitative description of the facility's overall adequacy as well as that of its component parts. The evaluation process involves a series of data gathering tasks.

   Initially, three types of data must be collected: data relating to functional adequacy; data relating to physical adequacy; and data relating to operational adequacy.

   In the following sections, these data categories are discussed and the suggested checklists to be used in the evaluation process are presented and described in terms of their uses and applications. With
the use of such checklists, data in each of these categories can be compiled and evaluated in terms of both the facility in question as well as other comparable facilities or qualitative standards that have been adopted in the jurisdictions. Quality ratings can then be derived from these evaluations and used to compare the adequacy of all facilities in a district, circuit, region or state.

a. Functional Data

Functional data can be collected through the checklists which deal with space, area and accessibility. To evaluate this data, priorities must be developed to provide a guideline for determining the relative importance of each data element to the determination of overall facility quality.

b. Physical Data

Data relating to accommodations is considered physical data. This data will describe the condition of the building and the quality of the comfort and amenities it provides. Information will be gathered relating to the condition of the building's structure, heating, cooling, lighting, plumbing and electrical systems, building furnishings, acoustics and other features which, if absent or of poor quality, are annoyances although they will not prevent the business of the court from taking place.

c. Operational Adequacy Data

Data relating to operational adequacy describes the capacity of the building to accommodate the case processing functions required of the caseload. If the current or expected caseload is far more than the facility can handle, it cannot be deemed adequate in reference to the amount of business it must support no matter how high its functional and physical quality appear. Such a facility is not necessarily a poor one; on the contrary, many of the country's oldest and finest court buildings are not operationally adequate. Ways must be found, however, to match the facility's available operational capacity to its caseload.

3. Data Collection

a. Collecting Functional Data

(1) Space Data

Certain spaces are generally considered to be required in a courthouse for its proper functioning (courtroom, judge's chambers, clerk's office, etc.). Other spaces are desirable, although perhaps they could be located elsewhere (jury assembly room, attorney conference room, law library, etc.). Still other spaces are suitable for the courthouse but would not greatly reduce its functional quality if they were located elsewhere (office of the Commonwealth Attorney, court administrator, etc.).
The spaces necessary for the proper functioning of a court depend upon the volume and type of that court's business. For example, a traffic violations court must be able to process a large volume of short cases, but a felony trial court requires facilities for holding prisoners, rooms for juries, and spaces designed for a smaller number of cases of longer duration. Regardless of court functioning levels, the essential spaces which must be provided for a court fall into three groups:

- spaces which must be in a courthouse because they are directly related to each other and to the proper functioning of the court;
- spaces which should be in a courthouse but can be located elsewhere at the possible cost of some inconvenience; and
- spaces which may be located in a courthouse, if desired, but may be located elsewhere according to local policy.

Figure 3 on the following page lists typical spaces in each of these categories. Figure 4 is a checklist for evaluating the degree to which these spaces are provided in a court facility.

(2) Area Data

Each space contained in a courthouse should have an area of at least the minimum amount of net square feet (nsf) considered necessary for the effective performance of the functions it houses. Whether an area is adequate depends upon the requirements of the functions it must house. For example, the size of a clerk's office depends upon such factors as the quantity of records which must be maintained pursuant to records retention schedules or policies, the clerk's record storage needs and equipment, the number of public visitors who come into the office, etc. To determine whether the area provided to an office is sufficient requires analysis of that particular office and its operations.

Minimum sizes considered adequate for specific types of space in new courthouses have been worked out and frequently are used as standards, but they cannot easily be applied to existing buildings. These new building standards must be interpreted with a good deal of flexibility to assess the adequacy of existing buildings which often cannot and need not be modified simply to increase the square footage of certain rooms. Other factors must be taken into account in existing buildings, including such diverse issues as: rates of population and caseload growth, for example (which affect the number of spaces needed and the size of courtrooms required), records management procedures (which can determine the area needed for file storage), and the frequency and duration of use of certain spaces (i.e., can construction of a larger jury room be justified if it will be used only infrequently and for deliberations usually lasting less than two hours?). To illustrate, if the area standards for jury rooms in new facilities were
FIGURE 3

CATEGORIES OF SPACE NECESSARY FOR JUDICIAL PROCESS
AND THEIR RECOMMENDED LOCATIONS

JUDICIAL SPACES which must be located in the courthouse:
- COURTHOUSE
- HEARING ROOM
- HOLDING CELL (can be shared)

ANCILLARY SPACES which should be located in the courthouse:
- CHAMBERS
- JUDGE (optional Hearing/Conference space)
- COURT REPORTERS (optional, may be central)

RELATED SPACES which may be located in the courthouse:
- JURY COMMISSION
- PROBATION (Investigation, Administration)
- CENTRAL DETENTION (optional, may be replaced by court cells)
- GRAND JURY
- CIRCUIT CLERK (court records)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REQUIRED SPACES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge's Chambers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury Deliberation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk's Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding Cell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Juror Waiting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DESIRED SPACES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury Assembly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness Waiting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Reporter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUITABLE SPACES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>